DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 600 EA 024 655

AUTHOR Johnson, Bob L., Jr.
TITLE The Logic of School Restructuring: A Conceptual Analysis.
PUB DATE Aug 90
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Organizational Change; Organizational Climate; *Organizational Development; *School Organization; *School Restructuring; Systems Approach

ABSTRACT

This paper offers a new conceptual framework for thinking about school restructuring by examining the meaning and implications of restructuring as a school improvement strategy. Conceptualization efforts are organized around a set of fundamental questions: (1) What is the meaning of restructuring? (2) What makes restructuring necessary? (3) What is the "telos" of restructuring? (4) What are the focus and scope of restructuring efforts? and (5) How is restructuring to be accomplished? The "organizational restructuring" of schools refers to altering the parts of a school structure, the relationships among the parts that define the school, and the overall character of the structural entity known as the school. The desired end, or "telos," of all restructuring efforts arises from the incongruencies between the consequences of current school structure and those desired consequences dictated by dominant theory and assumptions. The common element in all structural changes, regardless of focus and change, is the restructuring of organizational roles and relationships. It is concluded that implementation of a restructuring plan is guided by several considerations: the desired ends, identification of strategic linkages within the school organization, and the focal point of restructuring efforts. Potential barriers may arise from ideological, cultural, or bureaucratic sources. (Contains 31 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354600

THE LOGIC OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING:

A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

by

Bob L. Johnson, Jr.
Louisiana State University

August 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Johnson, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RUNNING HEAD: LOGIC OF RESTRUCTURING

EA 024 655

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

The term "restructuring" has become the latest buzzword of educational reform. No longer is it enough, school reformers argue, to improve the quality of teaching and learning. The very organizations in which teaching and learning are imbedded must be changed--schools must be restructured.

What good there may be in the "restructuring" movement however is often lost in a fuzzy understanding of the work that seems to prevail in discussions of the issue. School restructuring programs have been launched in a number of states. Yet, in each case those involved have thought about restructuring in different ways. At present, the scarcity of reflective literature surrounding the meaning of restructuring contributes to a conceptual ambiguity. The purpose of this paper is to provide researchers/practitioners with a possible framework for thinking about school restructuring. While not an attempt to offer a comprehensive explanation, a conscious effort is made to move towards a theory of restructuring. Conceptualization efforts are organized around a set of fundamental questions: 1) What is restructuring? 2) What makes restructuring necessary? 3) What is the telos of school restructuring? 4) What are the focus and scope of restructuring? and; 5) How is restructuring to be accomplished?

THE LOGIC OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING: A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

Perusal of the educational literature since 1983 reveals the flood of attention given to reform in this decade. Fueled by reports much like A Nation at Risk and the efforts of personalities such as former Secretary of Education William Bennett, the rhetoric of reform abounds. In state houses across the nation such rhetoric has found expression in reform legislation ranging from career ladders to competency testing. Accompanying this variegation has been a host of buzzwords which seem to have permeated the colloquial language of reform--"mediocrity," "back to the basics," "efficiency," "competency," "educational deficit," "excellence,"--to name but a few.

Yet, six years after A Nation At Risk the inquiring observer is led to question the nature and progress of enacted reforms. Among such inquiries has been the attempt to identify discernable reform patterns across the states. The work of Darling-Hammond & Berry is an example of this type of inquiry.[1] Using the "wave" analogy to chart the evolution of reform efforts, they have identified three discernable waves of state mandated educational reform: the efficiency wave, the teacher-proof curricula wave, and the return to basics wave. While Darling-Hammond & Berry's work focuses on teacher-targeted reforms, the "wave" analogy they employ proves useful as a means of conceptualizing the various reform themes emphasized since 1983.

As the final decade of this century breaks on the horizon, a new wave of educational reform appears to be approaching shore. Whereas previous reforms have focused on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of existing educational structures and practices, the coming wave focuses on the restructuring of an outmoded educational structure--a structure left unchanged by a residue of incremental changes. Noting that the U.S. has wasted billions

of dollars on poorly conceived, politically popular reforms, Orlich[2] suggests that the time for new approaches to school improvement has come. Commission reports from business, education, and statewide policy groups have also called for major changes in the ways schools go about their work and the ways teachers are involved in the decision making structure. For example, the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching noted in its report on the teaching profession.....

> "What is now needed is a fundamental redesign and restructure of the teaching force and the schools in order to provide a professional environment for teaching..."[3]

Likewise, David Kearns, CEO of the Xerox Corporation has called for "strategic changes that [will] restructure the way our schools are organized and operate."[4]

Yet, although at present the idea of restructuring appears to be coming into vogue it would be a mistake to assume that the idea is new. American education is replete with restructuring attempts both successful and unsuccessful, e.g. graded schools, self-contained classrooms, open classrooms and architecture, etc. Writing twenty years ago, Goodlad in his examination of teacher education concluded that nothing short of a simultaneous reconstruction of pre-service/in-service teacher education and school organizations would suffice for significant educational change and school improvement.[5] After twenty years it would appear that "restructuring" as an improvement strategy is coming of age in this reform-minded era of American education.

The purpose of this essay is to add to the current dialogue surrounding educational reform strategies by offering a fresh conceptualization of restructuring. This is done by examining the meaning and implications of restructuring as a school improvement strategy. While by no means an attempt to offer a comprehensive explanation, a conscious effort is made to move towards a theory of restructuring.

Motivations for the essay are two-fold. The first is rooted in the present scarcity of literature focusing on the meaning and conceptualization of restructuring. While works on the restructuring of schools are beginning to appear, few have focused on the meaning and organizational implications inherent in restructuring efforts.[6] The majority of restructuring literature to date appears prescriptive in tone. The second motivating concern is to address possible misconceptions of the meaning of restructuring. Restructuring deals with some old themes--organizational change, educational reform--yet, it represents an effort to talk about these in a new way. Furthermore, the leap from restructuring reports to restructuring realities is a difficult one. There are few if any precedents, few models and no guidelines.[7]

Conceptualization efforts are organized around a set of fundamental questions: 1) What is meaning of restructuring? 2) What makes restructuring necessary? 3) What is the telos of school restructuring? 4) What are the focus and scope of restructuring?...and 5) How is restructuring to be accomplished?

WHAT IS THE MEANING OF RESTRUCTURING?

Conceptualization of restructuring begins with a definition of the term. As would appear evident, the word may be broken down into two basic parts: the prefix "re" existing in combination with the root "structure." The English "structure" is a derivative of the Latin structura. The prominent idea behind the word is that of a building identified by its particular arrangement of parts. Structura is found used as a noun and verb. Thus, while "structure" refers to a "building" identified by its arrangement of parts, "to structure" is the act of "arranging or putting together" parts to form a building.[8] Modern usage of the word appears to have drifted little from its Latin derivative. Contemporary definitions identify structure in

similar terms: as an entity composed of various parts, elements and/or constituents arranged together in some specific way; or as an act of arranging parts, elements and/or constituents into a unique, identifiable form. The act of structuring appears to have as its end the creating of the entity or structure itself--that is to say the act of structuring leads to a structure.

As a word, structure is applied across a variety of contexts. One hears of atomic and molecular structure, architectural structure, geological structure, the structure of a musical composition, social structure, governmental structure, organizational structure and the structure of science. Furthermore, references are frequently made in our language to the act of structuring. Talk is heard of constructing--building structures, destructing--dismantling structures, and restructuring--rebuilding structures.

Regardless of how it is used however, several ideas seem to be associated with this concept known as structure. These are worthy of note. The first idea is that of entity. A structure is an entity defined by its unique composition and arrangement of parts. Water, for example, is a structural entity defined by its unique composition and arrangement of parts: H_2O, two atoms of hydrogen bonded with one atom of oxygen. An automobile is also a structural entity defined by its unique composition and arrangement of parts.

A second idea associated with the concept of structure is composition of parts. A structural entity is composed of individual parts, elements, and/or constituents which when taken together give the structure its identity. Although part of the structure, the individual parts are not to be confused with the structure itself. Returning to the example of water, neither hydrogen nor oxygen atoms are water but both atoms make up the structure of water. Similarly, the individual parts of the car are not the car. A tire is not a car but tires and several other individual parts can be combined to create a structure known as a car.

A third implicit idea associated with the concept of structure is that of relationship. It is important to note that it is the nature and combination of the relationships between and among the individual parts of a structure which define a given structure. The unique relationship of parts one to another define the structure being considered. An alteration of such relationships would change the definition and nature of the structure. A specific structural atomic relationship defines water: particular relationships exists between the one oxygen atom and the two atoms of hydrogen i.e. the ratio is 2:1, a specific angle exists between the two hydrogen atoms, etc. However, adding a third element such as sulphur to water would lead to certain consequences---H_2SO_4, sulfuric acid, an altogether different molecular structure which as a distinct structure possesses its own unique set of physical properties. Rearranging such relationships leads to a redefinition of the relationships between and among the structure's individual parts and thus to a redefinition of the original structure. With such thoughts in mind, restructuring may be defined as the rearrangement (whether by addition, subtraction, or movement) of the individual parts which define a given structure so as to redefine or even create new relationships between and among its composite parts.

In order to place this concept of restructuring within the current reform dialogue in education, additional observations and definitions are needed. The discussion begins with organizations. Barnard has defined the organization as "a system of consciously coordinated activities of two or more persons."[9] Given this definition, one may conclude that all organizations have an identifiable system or structure. That is to say, there are within an organization various parts, elements, and constituents which exist in certain patterned relationships so as to define that particular type of organization.

Though there are slight variations across the U.S., public schools would appear to

have an identifiable, generic organizational structure.[10] This structure consists of elements such as curricula, teachers, students, administrators, buildings, classes, equipment and the relationships between these. For example, in the school: teachers have instructional authority over students; textbooks tend to be the focal point of curricula activity; instruction is graded; and teachers perform their duties isolated in classrooms from their colleagues. These features along with many others come together in complex relationships to define the organizational structure of schools. To speak, therefore, of the organizational "restructuring" of schools is to speak of : 1) altering the parts of the school structure; 2) altering the relationships among the parts which define the school, and; 3) changing the overall character of the structural entity known as the school.

Of special importance is the nature of change that occurs as a result of restructuring. Organizational restructuring as described above represents a systemic as opposed to a cosmetic change. The distinction made between the two types of change is crucial. Cosmetic change does not seek to alter the basic structure of an organization. Rather, its seeks to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the individual parts as they exist. Structural integrity remains unthreatened. Arguing that the majority of recent educational reforms are to be characterized as such, Cuban has identified cosmetic change as "first-order" change.[11] Recruiting better teachers, raising salaries, improving the content of course work, modernizing facilities are examples of changes which do not threaten the structural status quo of schools. Those who promote such change assume that the existing goals and structure of schools are adequate and desirable.

On the other hand systemic change seeks alteration of the basic organizational structure.[12] This alteration of structure or "restructuring" occurs when: 1) dramatic change

comes to the individual elements which comprise a structure, and 2) the relationships between and among the elements that comprise a structure are altered. Changes of this sort introduce new goals, structures, and roles that alter the fundamental nature of an organization. Recent examples of systemic change in education include such reforms as open classrooms, school voucher plans, school-based management plans, non-graded schools, etc. Each of these examples represent alternatives--some radical--to the present educational delivery system. Incorporation of such reforms would require an alteration of the current school structure. Proponents of systemic change view the existing goals and structures of schools as inadequate and undesirable.

WHAT MAKES RESTRUCTURING NECESSARY?

A second question which must be asked regarding the latest educational reform wave focuses on the causes and motivations behind restructuring efforts. Why restructure? What makes organizational restructuring necessary? What motivates the demands for restructuring America's schools? To answer these questions one must take note of the forces operating both within and without a given organization.

Organizations such as schools are systems of social interaction comprised of interacting personalities and bound together by interdependent relationships. As such they are purposive--that is to say the activities and coordinating efforts that occur within organizations are driven by articulated and often unarticulated goals. The purposive nature of an organization produces a rationality which finds expression in its structure. Although the sophistication of this rationality varies from organization to organization, organizational structure would appear to be a function of organizational purpose. Thus, the internal forces of an organization are "organized" and "structured"---its individual parts, elements, and

constituents are arranged and put into relation with each other--to achieve the goals and aims for which the organization was created. The crucial question regarding a given organization then becomes: how does the present organizational structure lend itself to the achievement of organizational goals?

While society's goals for its schools are indeed diffuse and varied, one cannot deny the primacy given to the goal of educating children. Regardless of how education is defined, society agrees on this broad goal. The organizational structure of public schools that has evolved over the years can be understood as a rational response to this overriding goal. Although the sophistication of this response may be questioned, the structure of American schools remains a function of this educational purpose.[13]

Close examination of the internal forces and structure of an organization reveals the existence of influences whose origins lie outside of the organization. Organizations are not only influenced by their environments but dependent on them as well. The environment of an organization provides both input and feedback to the organization. Use of the adjective "public" to describe schools provides no small clue to the extent of environmental influences which exist therein. Schools are particularly vulnerable to their environments. The environment of the school organization provides it with personnel, clientele, financial resources, ideological support, and in a broad sense the criteria with which to judge organizational effectiveness. The survival of a given organizational structure is dependent on its ability to adapt to the changes and demands of the environment. Survival of the current structure of the public school rests on the ability of that structure to adapt to the changes and demands of the environment.

Awareness of the fact that organizational and environmental forces do act within and

upon the school organization in determinative ways provides the backdrop for understanding present demands for restructuring. It would appear that demands originating in the organizational environment create demands and stress on organizational structure. When the organizational stress generated in the environment exceeds the capabilities of the organizational structure, restructuring becomes necessary. Consider the following example. In light of the fact that an increasing number of jobs require familiarity with automation, it is argued that public education is failing to produce students capable of mastering the technical skills required for such jobs. Put another way, the present configuration of individual parts, elements and constituents that define the structural entity known as the school is failing to produce students who possess the skills necessary for employment in a technologically advancing society. In this example demands from the environment may be visualized as creating stress for the school structure. As stress increases, the structural integrity of the school organization is eventually pressed beyond its capabilities. However, if organizational restructuring occurs--a reconfigurration of the parts, elements and constituents that define the structural entity know as the school--the probabilities of successful adaptation to environmental demands increase.

Concerns for the restructuring of schools are motivated by various demands made on the educational system from its environment. These concerns may be conceptualized as being philosophical, political, economic, or societal in nature. While this taxonomy may appear clean, in reality proponents for restructuring may in fact be motivated by more than one of these concerns. Philosophical concerns for the restructuring of education focus on the perceived incongruity which exists between the purposes and aims of education and the organizational structure of schools. Although the goals and aims of education have been

characterized as being diffuse and varied, there are those who feel that these cannot be achieved concomitantly through the existing educational structure. For example, it is assumed that one purpose of schools is to increase learning. Yet, it is argued that schools have been structured in ways that distort that purpose and even contradict it. Schools at times would seem to be structured more for control than for learning.[14] In addition to arguments considering the concomitant pursuit of educational goals is the concern of many regarding the ability of the present educational structure to effectively achieve any goal. Declining test scores, an ever threatening drop-out rate, increasing violence, and the flourishing private school market are evidences identified by many that the present school structure is over-stressed. Three alternatives exist for the resolution of such incongruous relationships: 1) the goals and aims of education must be redefined; 2) schools must be restructured so that the goals and aims set for them by society can be met; 3) both the goals and aims of education must be changed and the restructuring of schools must take place.

Closely related to these philosophic concerns are the political motivations for restructuring. Political motivations for the restructuring of schools spring from the soil of the Marxist--Frankfurt traditions. Individuals motivated by political concerns see the present educational structure in this country as a means of perpetuating control for some and deprivation for others.[15] Deprivation, it is argued, robs individuals of their potential as human beings and leads to widespread dissatisfaction. Control must be broken and the deprived freed. The entire authority and decision making structures of society's institutions must be revised. Emancipation and subsequent empowerment are to be realized through the restructuring (in its most radical form revolution) of society. As an important part of the

existing establishment which perpetuates the control of the bourgeois the educational system likewise stands in need of restructuring.

While the preceding description represents a radical form of political restructuring, it is important to note that demands for teacher empowerment have their roots in this ideology. Under the current structure of schools the role of teachers is such that the full wisdom and educational leadership potential of teachers remains untapped. Implicit within the less radical restructuring motivations of this sort is the goal of building a new set of relationships between and among teachers and administrators. This redefinition of authority arrangements within the school community means an enlargement of the educational leadership team and the defining of new roles for key school actors.[16] Organizational restructuring means the redefinition of roles and relationships among the parts, elements and constituents of the structure.

Economic concerns serve as a third motivation for the restructuring of schools. Such concerns appear to be the dominant theme of corporate America.[17] The argument is a familiar one. Public education has put this country at a terrible competitive disadvantage. The American workforce is running out of qualified people. The basic skills of our workforce--particularly at the entry level--are simply not good enough for the U.S. to compete in the world economy. The cost of education has more than dramatically increased over the years. Education presently consumes almost 7% of the GNP. According to Kearns, no other sector of society has absorbed more money by serving fewer people with steadily declining service. A business-as-usual approach to education will lead to an increasingly troubled future for this nation and its economy. Hope for the country and its economy lies in a commitment to the restructuring of the organization of American education.[18]

A final classification of restructuring motivations focuses on societal concerns.[19]

LOGIC OF RESTRUCTURING

While the needs of society have changed drastically since 1900, the historic structure of public schooling has changed relatively little. Basic ways of educating children in the public schools have exhibited a remarkable durability. It would appear that our present educational delivery system was designed and developed for learners with needs different from those of contemporary students. Organized along the lines of a factory and governed by an agricultural calendar, the current structure of schools represents for many an anachronistic system which has outlived its usefulness. Reports calling for a fundamental restructuring of the educational delivery system indicate that many recognize that the traditional educational structure is incapable of meeting the demands and stresses of the twenty-first century.

WHAT IS THE TELOS OF SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING?

It is logical to assume that proponents of school restructuring share two basic assumptions: 1) inherent in the present structure of schooling are dysfunctional aspects which cosmetic change cannot address; and 2) there exists a preferred state of school affairs, realization of which comes only through organizational restructuring. Contemplation of these assumptions naturally leads to questions regarding the telos or desired end of restructuring efforts and the factors which dictate this end. The telos of school restructuring is derived from two sources. These are the nature and consequences of the present school structure and the preferred organizational consequences sought.

Conceptualization of the restructured organization begins with a fundamental knowledge of the major properties and functions of the present school organization. What are the individual parts, elements and constituents that make up this structural entity known as the school? What is the nature of relationships between and among these? Such

questions force one to examine and identify the characteristic inputs, throughputs, and outputs of the current school structure and the linkages which exist among them. Also involved are the identification and examination of various school actors and the nature of the roles assumed by each. A theory of restructuring builds on such information to describe both the goal of restructuring and how it is to occur.

In addition to an organizational/rationalization theory, restructuring efforts would appear to be guided by some theory of pedagogy (teaching/learning). As noted earlier, regardless of how diffuse the goals of education may be, the fact that schools exist to educate students cannot be denied. This remains true in spite of an ill-defined technology of teaching--a technology which exists nonetheless. The mere existence of restructuring as a reform alternative implies that proponents have an idea of how students learn, how teachers should teach, and the type of organizational structure needed to facilitate both processes.[20] Although the comprehensiveness and full implications of these ideas may indeed be lacking, such ideas define the end of restructuring efforts. Prevailing assumptions of child development, effective instructional techniques and the psychology of learning--assumptions inherent in any pedagogical theory--logically serve as crucial factors in determining the deficiencies of the present structure and the possibilities of the restructured organization. Thus, the telos of school restructuring is to a large degree determined by prevailing pedagogical theories and assumptions of key policy makers.

As an example of how the present structure of schools and prevailing pedagogical theory combine to define and guide restructuring efforts, one need only examine the current debate concerning the role of teachers within schools. The present call is for teacher "empowerment." It is argued that certain aspects inherent in the school structure prevent

teachers from controlling important aspects of their work. Evidence of this is seen in the decision-making structures found in many schools--the top-down approach. Decisions sensitive to teachers and directly affecting classroom activity are often made without teacher consent, e.g. allocation of resources, class size, curriculum choices, student assignments, classroom interruptions, testing requirements, etc. The frustration experienced by teachers as a result of exclusion, coupled with the bureaucratic rigidity associated with this type of decision-making approach, threaten the instructional flexibility needed for effective classroom instruction. In this case the structural features of the school conflict with pedagogical theory. The result is a call for the redefinition and restructuring of the teacher's role in the authority structure of the school.[21]

A second example of conflict between school structure and pedagogical theory is found in the control/educate tension found in schools. Within the present structure, arrangements in the school are such that administrative control often displaces education as the primary focus of the classroom.[22] While the administrative structure should facilitate the educative structure, the exigencies of the school experience have created a control oriented structure which has serious consequences for the educational process. Arrangements of the current school structure appear to have a three-fold effect on teachers/teaching. The current control structure: 1) tends to perpetuate a conservatism among the profession; 2) prevents teachers from expressing their full expertise as educators; and 3) has a "de-skilling" effect on teachers.[23] A rethinking and subsequent restructuring of the control configuration in schools for purposes of addressing these consequences would appear in order.

Regardless of the desired end of organizational restructuring, the telos of all restructuring efforts arises from the incongruities which exist between the consequences of

the current school structure and those desired consequences as dictated by current pedagogical theory and assumptions.[24] The character of the restructured organization becomes the rational expression of these assumptions.

WHAT ARE THE FOCUS AND SCOPE OF RESTRUCTURING EFFORTS?

Any attempt to understand the meaning and nature of restructuring must address issues of focus and scope. Reexamination of the definition given to structure will illuminate the significance of both concepts to the restructuring process.

Organizational structure may be defined as the unique arrangement of parts, elements and constituents within an organization that define it as an entity. Restructuring is said to occur when these ingredients are rearranged so as to create new relationships between and among the individual parts. These new relationships serve to redefine the nature of the organization. Questions regarding the focus of restructuring center on the identification of those particular organizational parts, elements or constituents that are to become the targets of alteration/manipulation. For example, will the points of leverage targeted by restructuring focus solely on the organization's division of labor, authority structure, physical layout or a combination of these? Questions such as this have as their concern the focus of restructuring.

Issues regarding the scope of restructuring center on the extent and breadth of restructuring efforts. To speak of scope in this manner is to infer the existence of a restructuring continuum. At one end are restructuring schemes mild in both design and effects--at the other extreme, schemes more radical in nature. Yet to make such distinctions is to ignore the complex matrix of relationships that define organizational structure. The

complex, interactive nature of relationships defining the organization often make the measurement and predictability of manipulated efforts extremely difficult. Nevertheless, arguments in the current restructuring debate do vary in terms of suggested scope. There are those, for example, who call for a restructuring of the entire educational process from school house to state house.[25] On the other hand, less radical suggestions such as those focusing on the spatial restructuring of the school also exist. The restructuring scope of the former proposal would appear much broader than that of the latter.

A greater understanding of restructuring focus and scope may be gleaned from an examination of the structural complexity found in organized behavior. Structural complexity refers to the amount of horizontal, vertical, and spatial differentiation that exists within a given organization.[26] Broadly speaking, restructuring focus has as its target one or more of these three dimensions. While these elements exist in varying degrees across different types of organizations, the degree to which each exists in a given organization influences decisions regarding the focus and scope of restructuring efforts. The level and mix of complexity that characterize the present school structure, for example, provide a baseline from which to plan and predict both the focus and scope of restructuring efforts. Identification of complexity sub-components provides additional insight into how this is done.

The degree of differentiation between and among organizational parts, elements, and constituents defines the horizontal complexity of a given organization. Such differentiation, as expressed in the division of labor, is based on the orientation of members, the nature of tasks performed, the technology available to perform these tasks, and the amount of education and training required for task performance.

The degree of horizontal differentiation which exists in a school is certainly distinct

from that of other organizations, e.g. the United States Army, GM Assembly plant, shoe repair shop, etc. The division of labor within the school arises from the performance of three basic school functions: managerial, teaching, and support functions. While further differentiation may be made within each of these categories, e.g. teachers are divided by subject and grade, support personnel are divided according to their respective areas of responsibility--cafeteria, maintenance, classroom aid, etc.--the present reward and allocation structure found in schools has as its basis this functional scheme. Rearrangement of this traditional division of labor means focusing on the horizontal dimension of the organization.

The vertical dimension of structural complexity refers to the depth of organizational structure. Differentiation increases, and hence complexity, as the number of hierarchical levels in the organization increases. Vertically complexity would appear to be a logical correlate of horizontal complexity.

The organization with an extensive division of labor creates a greater demand for organizational coordination than one with a simpler horizontal configuration. The authority patterns, decision-making structure, and degree of centralization peculiar to a particular type of organization are inextricably bound to its vertical depth. Restructuring dealing with these types of issues must have as its focus the vertical dimension of the organizational structure.

The third structural complexity component is that of spatial differentiation. As the designation implies, reference is to the physical layout or structure of an organization. Descriptions of spatial differentiation have as their focus the geographical location of central offices, work tools, work activity and personnel within the organization.

The spatial structure of schools is by now well known. Teachers perform the majority of their duties in physically isolated classroom separated from their colleagues most of the

day. Classrooms are located away from the principal's office, often in separate buildings. Furthermore, schools are dispersed throughout the district and are frequently located several miles from the central office. Spatial features such as these have implications for the types of relationships which develop between various school personnel. For example, such spatial characteristics affect the nature of supervision exercised by principals and superintendents. Teachers, because of their physical isolation, enjoy less supervision than would otherwise be expected. Likewise, the fact that the school site is physically distanced from the central office prevents tight supervision by the superintendent. Restructuring of the array of relationships and behavior associated with an organization's physical arrangement must have as its focus the spatial dimension of organizational structure.

Regardless of focus and scope, the common element in all structural changes is the restructuring of organizational roles and relationships.[27] Rearrangement of organizational parts, elements and constituents has as its consequence the redefinition of organizational roles. This should come as no surprise, particularly when it is realized that organizational structure has consequences for human behavior. Alteration of roles and associated expectations due to restructuring affect the behavior patterns of organizational participants.

HOW IS RESTRUCTURING TO BE DONE?

Implementation of the restructuring plan is guided by several important considerations. The first is that of telos or desired ends. The preferred state of affairs as derived from the current state of structural affairs may be likened unto the compass which guides the traveler to his destination. While it does not tell him which specific route to take it does provide him with the general direction in which to go. A second guiding consideration, however, does address this specificity of means. Its concern is with the identification of those organizational

cause and effect linkages which allow for the strategic planning of restructuring. Although one's experience within organizations proves helpful in discerning such linkages, the complex, interactive nature of these causal relationships make both the explanation and empirical justification of these linkages most difficult. As a result, many organizational relationships and much structural variation go unexplained.

A third logistical consideration which guides the restructuring plan arises from the focus of restructuring. As noted above, restructuring focus refers to that particular organizational element (or set of elements) targeted for alteration/manipulation. Determination of this focus logically follows the identification of an hypothesized set of causal linkages within an organization. Restructuring focus assists in guiding the formulation and subsequent implementation of restructuring plans. Thus, considerations guiding the development of a restructuring implementation strategy include: 1) an idea of what state of organizational affairs is desired; 2) some knowledge--however incomplete--of the linkages which exist in a given organization; and 3) an organizational focal point at which to direct efforts.

Yet, in spite of the best made plans, the restructuring of organizations does not occur in a vacuum. Discarding the old and implementing the new represent no small tasks. Although not entirely knowable a priori, barriers to restructuring must be anticipated.

Potential barriers to organizational restructuring have as their origin various sources. Restructuring may be resisted on ideological grounds. The new set of relationships proposed and brought on by restructuring could violate the basic ideological assumptions, traditions, and prevailing cultural norms of the society in which the organization exists. In a similar vein, restructuring proposals could go against the culture of a given organization.[28] The conservative culture of the teaching profession, for example, represents a barrier to the

restructuring of schools.[29] Overcoming barriers of this type require a change in the proposed structure or a change in organizational culture. Structural constraints inherent in the existing structure of an organization represent yet another source of restructuring barriers. Bureaucratic rigidity and structural inertia represent formidable obstacles for any type of change.[30] Political considerations may hinder restructuring efforts. For those who enjoy power within the existing structure, challenges to the status quo are to be resisted as restructuring threatens this power.

The need for an awareness of restructuring barriers is underscored by the noted resiliency of the school organization to structural changes over the years.[31] This resiliency stands as testimony to those barriers and unintended consequences which previous restructuring efforts have failed to overcome. If restructuring is to be successful such barriers must be anticipated and addressed.

CONCLUSION

Motivated by the present scarcity of reflective literature, an incipient theoretical framework for conceptualizing school restructuring has been presented above. This framework has addressed the meaning, necessity, telos, focus, scope, and logistics of restructuring.

To speak of the organizational "restructuring" of schools is to speak of : 1) altering the parts of the school structure; 2) altering the relationships among the parts which define the school; and 3) changing the overall character of the structural entity known as the school. It would appear that such restructuring becomes necessary when the organizational stress generated in the environment of the school exceeds the capabilities of its structure.

Regardless of the desired end, the telos of all restructuring efforts arises from the incongruities which exist between the consequences of the current school structure and those desired consequences as dictated by dominant pedagogical theory and assumptions.

Questions regarding the focus of restructuring center on the identification of those particular organizational parts, elements or constituents that are to become the targets of alteration/manipulation. Issues regarding the scope of restructuring center on the extent and breadth of restructuring efforts. The common element in all structural changes, regardless of focus and scope, is the restructuring of organizational roles and relationships. School restructuring does not occur in a vacuum. Implementation of a restructuring plan is guided by several considerations: 1) the telos or desired ends of restructuring; 2) identification of the strategic linkages within the school organization; and 3) the focal point of restructuring efforts. Potential barriers to restructuring may arise from ideological, cultural, or bureaucratic sources.

ENDNOTES

1. Linda Darling-Hammond & Barnett Berry, The Evolution of Teacher Policy (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation 1988).

2. Donald C. Orlich Staff Development: Enhancing Human Potential (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1989).

3. Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century (New York: Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, 1986).

4. David T. Kearns, "An Education Recovery Plan For America," Phi Delta Kappan 69 8 (April 1988): 565-570.

5. John I. Goodlad, "The Reconstruction of Teacher Education," Teachers College Record 72 (1970): 61-72.

6. Richard F. Elmore et al, Restructuring Schools: The Next Generation of Educational Reform (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990): 1-28.

7. Ann Lieberman & Lynn Miller, "Restructuring Schools: What Matters and What Works," Phi Delta Kappan 71 10 (June 1990): 759-764.

8. Oxford English Dictionary, 1989 ed., s.v. "structure."

9. Chester Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1938): 73.

10. See Charles Bidwell, "The School as a Formal Organization," in Handbook of Organizations, ed. by James G. March (Skokie, IL:Rand McNally, 1965). Karl E. Weick, "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems," Administrative Science Quarterly 21 (1976): 1-19. J. W. Meyer & Brian Rowan, "The Structure of Educational Organizations," in Environments and Organizations, ed by M. W. Meyer and Associates (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978).

11. Larry Cuban, "A Fundamental Puzzle of School Reform," Phi Delta Kappan 69 5 (January 1988): 340-344. Paul Watzlawick, John Weakland & Richard Fisch, Change: Principles of Problem Formation and Problem Resolution (New York: Norton, 1974).

12. Barbara Tye, "The Deep Structure of Schooling," Phi Delta Kappan 69 4 (December 1987): 281-284.

13. Michael D. Cohen, James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." Administrative Science Quarterly 17 1 (1972): 1-25.

14. Linda McNeil, Contradictions of Control (New York: Routledge & Keagen Paul, 1986).

15. Samuel Bowles & Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life (New York: Basic Books, 1976). Michael Apple, Educational and Power: Reproduction and Contradiction in Education (New York: Routledge & Keagen Paul, 1982).

16. Richard F. Elmore, "Reform and the Culture of Authority in Schools." Educational Administration Quarterly 23 4 (1987): 60-78.

17. Kearns, 1988.

18. Lewis J. Perelman, "Restructuring the System is the Solution," Phi Delta Kappan 70 1 (September 1988): 20-24.

19. Michael D. Cohen, Restructuring the Education System: Agenda for the '90's (Washington, DC: National Governors' Association, Center for Policy Research, 1987). Patricia C. Duttweiler, "Restructuring For Better Schools" (Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1989).

20. Brian Rowan, "Applying Conceptions of Teaching to Organizational Reform," in Restructuring Schools: The Next Generation of Educational Reform, ed. by Richard F. Elmore (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990): 31-58.

21. Elmore, 1987.

22. McNeil, 1986.

23. Harry Braverman, Labor and Monopoly Capital (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974). Richard Edwards, Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in America (New York: Basic Books, 1979).

24. Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (New York: Free Press, 1968).

25. Duttweiler, 1989.

26. Richard H. Hall, Organizations: Structure and Process (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972).

27. Daniel Katz & Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, 2nd edition (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978).

28. Seymor Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change, 2nd edition, (Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 1972).

29. Daniel C. Lortie, Schoolteacher (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975). Phillip W. Jackson, Life in Classrooms (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968).

30. Arthur E. Wise, Legislated Learning (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1979).

31. Larry Cuban, How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in the American Classroom, 1890-1980 (New York: Longman, 1984).